1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS Chris Carson, Esq., SBN 280048 Raymond Ballister Jr., Esq., SBN 111282 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771 Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082 Mail: PO Box 262490 San Diego, CA 92196-2490 Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com Attorneys for Plaintiff	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11		
12	Chris Langer,	Case No.
13	Plaintiff,	Complaint For Damages And
14	V.	Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's With Disabilities
15	13800 San Antonio, LLC , a California Limited Liability Company;	Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act
16	Joo Hyun Han ; and Does 1-10,	
17	Defendants.	
18		
19	Plaintiff Chris Langer complains of Defendants 13800 San Antonio,	
20	LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; Joo Hyun Han; and Does 1-10	
21	("Defendants"), and alleges as follows:	
22		
23		
24	PARTIES:	
25	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a	
26	paraplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility. He has a	
27	specially equipped van with a ramp that deploys out of the passenger side of	
28	his van and he has a Disabled Person Parking Placard issued to him by the State	

of California.

- 2. Defendant 13800 San Antonio, LLC owned the real property located at or about 13806 San Antonio Dr., Norwalk, California, in May 2018.
- 3. Defendant 13800 San Antonio, LLC owns the real property located at or about 13806 San Antonio Dr., Norwalk, California, currently.
- 4. Defendant Joo Hyun Han owned the San Antonio Spirit Shop located at or about 13806 San Antonio Dr., Norwalk, California, in May 2018.
- 5. Defendant Joo Hyun Han owns the San Antonio Spirit Shop ("Store") located at or about 13806 San Antonio Dr., Norwalk, California, currently.
- 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

- 7. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.
- 8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

 9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 10. Plaintiff went to the Store in May 2018 to shop.
- 11. The Store is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 12. Paths of travel are another one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by defendants to patrons of the Store.
- 13. Although there were shelves and merchandise aisles open to customers for shopping, the paths of travel in and throughout these merchandise aisles were not accessible because the defendants had a practice of placing merchandise and merchandise display on the route of travel restricting passage to less than 36 inches in width.
- 14. In fact, the average path of travel throughout the store is 38 inches wide and the narrowest pathway is 16 inches wide. This is simply too narrow for plaintiff.
- 15. Currently, although there are shelves and merchandise aisles open to customers for shopping, paths of travel in and throughout these merchandise aisles are not accessible to wheelchair users because the defendants have a practice of placing merchandise and merchandise display on the route of travel restricting passage to less than 36 inches in width.
- 16. Transaction counters are also one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of the Store.
- 17. Meanwhile, the transaction counter at the Store is more than 36 inches in height. In fact, the transaction counter is 38 inches high.
 - 18. There is no lowered, 36 inch portion of the transaction counter at the

Store for use by persons in wheelchairs.

- 19. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of the Store.
- 20. Unfortunately, even though there were parking spaces marked and reserved for persons with disabilities in the parking lot where the Store is located during Plaintiff's visit, all the parking stalls and access aisles were not level with each other because there were built up curb ramps running into the access aisles.
 - 21. These curb ramps caused slopes greater than 2.1%.
- 22. Additionally, the parking stalls and access aisles had slopes greater than 2.1%.
 - 23. Currently, these curb ramps cause slopes greater than 2.1%.
- 24. Currently, the parking stalls and access aisles are not level with each other and there are inaccessible slopes in both the access aisles and parking stalls.
 - 25. Plaintiff personally encountered these barriers.
- 26. These inaccessible conditions denied the plaintiff full and equal access and caused him difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment.
- 27. Plaintiff plans to return and patronize the Store but is deterred from visiting until the defendants remove the barriers.
- 28. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.
- 29. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of

access if complete removal were not achievable.

- 30. For example, there are numerous paint/stripe companies that will come and stripe a level parking stall and access aisle and install proper signage on rapid notice, with very modest expense, sometimes as low as \$300 in full compliance with federal and state access standards.
- 31. Another common barrier removal project is modifying transaction counters to make a portion of the counter accessible. This is a simple construction task, well within the capabilities of any general contractor. The task can be completed easily and for a modest price.
- 32. Plaintiff is deterred from returning and patronizing the Store because of his knowledge of the barriers that exist. Plaintiff will, nonetheless, return to assess ongoing compliance with the ADA and will return to patronize the Store as a customer once the barriers are removed.
- 33. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the violations and barriers alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to her disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

34. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this

complaint.

35. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D."
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

36. Under the 1991 Standards, parking spaces and access aisles must be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1:50 (2%) in all directions. 1991 Standards § 4.6.3. Here, the access aisle is not level and has a ramp taking up part of the access aisle. Under the 2010 Standards, access aisles shall be at the

same level as the parking spaces they serve. Changes in level are not permitted. 2010 Standards 502.4. "Access aisle are required to be nearly level in all directions to provide a surface for wheelchair transfer to and from vehicles." 2010 Standards § 502.4 Advisory. Specifically, built up curb ramps are not permitted to project into access aisles and parking spaces. *Id.* No more than a 1:48 slope is permitted. 2010 Standards § 502.4.

- 37. Here, the failure to provide level parking is a violation of the law.
- 38. Shelves and display units allowing self-service by customers at stores must be located on an accessible route. 1991 Standards § 4.1.3(12)(b). An accessible route must be at least 36 inches in width. 1991 Standards § 4.3.3.
- 39. Here, the failure to provide accessible paths of travel in and throughout the merchandise aisles is a violation of the law.
- 40. In areas used for transactions where counters have cash registers and are provided for sales or distribution of goods or services to the public, at least one of each type shall have a portion of the counter which is at least 36 inches in length with a maximum height of 36 inches above the floor. 1991 Standards § 7.2(1). Under the 2010 Standards, where the approach to the sales or service counter is a parallel approach, such as in this case, there must be a portion of the sales counter that is no higher than 36 inches above the floor and 36 inches in width and must extend the same depth as the rest of the sales or service counter top. 2010 Standards § 904.4 & 904.4.1.
- 41. Here, no such accessible counter has been provided in violation of the ADA.
- 42. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).
- 43. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

44. Given its location and options, plaintiff will continue to desire to patronize the Store but he has been and will continue to be discriminated against due to the lack of accessible facilities and, therefore, seeks injunctive relief to remove the barriers.

II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL

- **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ. Code § 51-53.)
- 45. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act ("Unruh Act") guarantees, inter alia, that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal. Civ. Code §51(b).
- 46. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).
- 47. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services offered.
- 48. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).)

PRAYER: Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide relief as follows: 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all. 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code § § 52. Dated: June 1, 2018 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS By: Chris Carson, Esq. Attorney for plaintiff